Management Training for the Operations Directorate

25X1

The Directorate of Operations can do a better job of identifying and developing managerial capabilities within its ranks; it must do so if it is to meet its operational responsibilities ahead.

This is the overall view arising out of a survey of middle and senior management within the Directorate as part of an Agency-wide effort coordinated by the Office of Training in early 1973. The survey encompassed written responses from 83 middle managers and interviews with 10 senior managers within the Directorate. (A more detailed statement of the survey mission and its findings is found in the enclosure to this paper.) These middle and senior managers of the DO generally assert that the operationally-skilled and oriented manager will continue to be the model within the Directorate, but that the managerial dimension must be given more emphasis. The DO can no longer afford the conduct of major business by officers who are 90% operator and 10% manager. On the other hand, managerial capability alone cannot suffice in DO work; it is an extra dimension that must be measured in every officer early in the career and nurtured in its growth wherever feasible. Management concepts such as leadership and communications on the one hand and organization of work and resources on the other find

25X1

some applicability even in handling agent case work. It is
thus possible for the case officer to display managerial
potential early in the career. It is likewise possible
for supervisors and managers to identify this potential and
begin to aid and test its development from early career stages.

The fitness report is the primary vehicle for identifying
managerial talent, as well as operational capability, and
it must be given fuller usage in this regard. More wide-
spread training should be given to supervisors in the prepara-
tion of fitness reports, and more supervisors should be
held accountable in their own fitness reports for shortcomings
in the identification and handling of managerial potential.

Managerial potential should be nurtured through both
structured training and assignment opportunities under
management tutelage, the latter being far more significant
than the former but also benefitting considerably from the
former. More assignments to deputy positions should be made
in the light of managerial training opportunities inherent
in the deputy position. Management skills and techniques
can be learned from such assignments either in the field or
at Headquarters but the factors of size and complexity that
tend to differentiate managerial problems and perspectives
from those of first-line supervision are to be found more
at Headquarters.

The Operations Directorate does not have, and cannot afford to create, separate classes of managers and operators. Managerial decisions within the directorate must be grounded in operational judgements that can come only from operational experience. The development of an officer from an operator to an operational supervisor and thence to an operational manager is as much a matter of perspective as of technique. The latter can be taught but the former is acquired from experience whereby the officer's focus on the "how" gradually shifts to the "why" of goal-setting and evaluation. This is the mark of the extra-dimensional officer required for middle and senior management of the DO.

Management training can help develop officer potential for management, but it cannot create it. The product of management training is limited by both the caliber of the training and the caliber of those taking it. The directorate is the loser when decisions on management course enrollment are left to the enrollees or are made on the basis of availability rather than on needs of the service. Only by getting the right people into management training can the DO realize the desired managerial gain from the training investment.

External training can be useful for broadening of perspective and regenerating career drives, but managerial training for the DO should be internal for the most part.

Outside experts can profitably be included within such
training but the context should be that of CIA -- preferably
DO -- management concerns. The officer student will usually
get the most benefit from training which he recognizes as
job-related. Closely akin to this is the need for management
training to be given to officers who can look ahead to about
ten more years in their career. (Most of the group questioned
in this survey would not meet this criterion.) In many cases
it would most appropriately come immediately following a
field assignment and prior to assumption of responsibilities
at Headquarters -- or at least prior to becoming "indispensible"
in the new job. Some consideration should be given to in-
stituting a counterpart to the COS Seminar for officers
moving into Headquarters branch chief and deputy chief posi-
tions. Courses should probably be no more than two weeks
in length, that period being about the maximum affordable
time away from Headquarters roles.

As to substance for management training, both the middle
managers and the senior managers responded with a diversity
of view in the best tradition of a directorate that has
long put store by diversity as a strength. The very term
"management" means different things to different DO officers,
many using it in its behavioral sense of leadership and
communication while many others use it in the impersonal
sense of organization of resources and the technology that

can assist in such organization. Some use "management" to subsume "leadership" while others view "management" as a tool of "leadership." From this wide variation of meaning flows a similar difference of view as to the nature of the "management problem" within the DO and, hence, a wide difference in recommended emphasis in management training. Parenthetically, it should be noted that any difference of view that might have been expected between the DO operations officer and his colleague from TSD or ISD in regard to management training was not borne out in the survey.

Conclusions arising from this survey of DO opinion on management training are as follows:

  a. Interest in management training is fairly widespread in the DO, although,

  b. There is no discernible consensus as to content of desired Agency management training.

  c. Knowledge of extant Agency training opportunities in supervision and management is remarkably thin among DO managers who not only might have profited themselves from such training but are in the command positions from which to guide the training of rising managers.

  d. There is a wide area of managerial concept and technique common to all Agency Directorates,

allowing for profitable participation by DO officers along with colleagues from other Directorates in Agency-wide management training.

    e. There is a parochial area of DO management training that might well be met by institution of a counterpart course for chiefs and deputy chiefs of DO branches similar in many respects to the Chiefs of Station Seminar.

6

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR MIDDLE MANAGERS

The Executive Director-Comptroller has asked the Office of Training to conduct a management training program for middle managers of the Agency. As a first step in developing such a program the Office of Training with the cooperation of the Deputy Directors has formed a Task Force composed of one representative from each of the four Directorates and under the chairmanship of an OTR officer. The mission of the Task Force is to idenify the training needs of middle managers and to make recommendations to the Director of Training.

The Task Force is now soliciting your opinion on the subject of management training for you and your successors.

Return questionnaire by 26 February 1973: Management Task Force
202 Chamber of Commerce Bldg.

Management Task Force representatives

25X1

)TR (Chairman)
)P
 DDI
)DS&T

202 Chamber of Commerce Bldg.

STAT

Name _____

Age	EOD	How many employees in your unit?	How many supervisors report to you?

25X1

If not delivered, please return to sender.

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

Survey Profile

A total of 103 questionnaires were sent to Directorate of Operations officers understood to be holding positions of middle management in early 1973. "Middle management" was arbitrarily defined for this purpose as constituting officers of GS-13 through GS-15 who were supervisors of supervisors. Most of the 103 fell into this category, but a few did not, and others chose to disqualify themselves based on impending retirement or other considerations. Ninety of the 103 questionnaires were returned, of which 83 could be used for study. These 83 were composed of 56 from operating divisions (45) and staffs (11), and 27 from TSD (21) and ISD (6).

Information requested of the respondent on the first page yields the following profiles of middle managers in the DO: Within the operating divisions and staffs, the middle manager is about 47 (40 to 57) years of age, has been with the Agency 21 (11 to 26) years, is GS-14 or GS-15 (only 1 GS-13 responded), and is part of an organizational unit of about 20 (1 to 150) in which he supervises 3 - 4 supervisors. Within TSD-ISD, the middle manager is only one year younger than his operational colleague, namely 46 (39 to 58), and has the same service of 21 years (1 to 24 years), but he is part of a larger unit of about 36 (1 to 356) in which he supervises 5 supervisors.

I. From the list of managerial responsibilities below, <u>select</u> those areas in which you need training and those in which your successor will need training. Indicate the extent of the training required by checks in the two columns on the right. If the list is not complete as far as your job is concerned, please add as required.

RESPONSIBILITIES   YOUR TRAINING NEEDS   SUCCESSOR'S TRAINING NEEDS

	Much	Some	Little	Much	Some	Little
Planning						
Setting objective						
Programming						
Budgeting						
Records management						
Other						
Organizing						
Encouraging innovation						
Coordinating						
Allocating resources						
Other						
Staffing						
Selecting personnel						
Career management						
Evaluating performance						
Other						
Directing						
Delegating of authority						
Motivating						
Communicating						
Leadership						
Conference management						
Scheduling of work						
Other						
Controlling						
Developing performance standards						
Measuring results (productivity)						
Counseling						
Disciplining						
Contract management						
Other						
Analysis						
Computer application						
Operations research						
Forecasting technique						
Other						

QUESTION I

This question offered more opportunity for statistical analysis than the other three but there are serious weaknesses in this data base for support of more than tentative conclusions and related recommendations. For example, the column heading "Successor's Training Needs" was misunderstood by a number of respondents who simply passed it by on the basis of not knowing who their successor might be. Likewise, there was an apparent difference of interpretation as to whether "Little" meant "none" or "a little bit." Also, we must assume that in any survey of this sort there are always extraneous factors influencing the responses such as self-imagery, the avoidance of admissions against interest, and patterned responses in test-taking. Unfortunately, the lack of vertical alignment of some answers also makes questionable the actual response to the question in some instances.

With these caveats in mind, certain observations can, however, be made from the data in hand. First, as might be expected, the middle managers of the Directorate of Operations (DO) recommend a good deal more training for those replacing them than they would desire for themselves at this point. There was no way to break down the responses into those new on the job and those who had been in place for some time, a factor that would certainly influence some of the responses. Nor was it feasible to break this

d.

down by age, grade, length of service, or level of position held. It was feasible, however, to divide the DO responses into two groups for comparison purposes, namely, those from TSD and ISD on the one hand, and those from the operating components and staffs of the DO on the other hand. Presumably, any difference of view within the DO would show up in this comparison between operators (artists?) and technicians.

Any difference to be found between these groups did not appear in the amounts of training needed by the respondents as compared with their successors. In fact, the following table shows an identical increase when the sum of each (Much-Some-Little) column was divided by the number of respondents (56 in Operations, 27 in TSD-ISD) and rounded off to the nearest whole number:

	Operations			TSD-ISD		
Successor needs	5	9	3	5	10	3
Own needs	2	6	7	2	7	7
Difference	+3	+3	-4	+3	+3	-4

Looking at the responses in more qualitative terms, the following table gives the selection frequency ranking (1 to 5, with 1 being highest) for the four groups, these top five selections covering 12 of the 24 responsibilities provided the respondents for consideration of training needs:

e

RESPONSIBILITY	Operations		TSD-ISD	
	OWN	SUCCESSOR	OWN	SUCCESSOR
Computer application	1		2	
Budgeting	2		5	
Programming	3	1		
Career management	4	3	1	2
Measuring results (productivity)	5			
Evaluating performance		2		
Motivating		4		4
Selecting personnel		5		3
Leadership				1
Conference management			3	
Allocating resources			4	
Communicating				5

The only responsibility calling for training of respondent
and successor alike in both the Operations and TSD-ISD
groups was career management (although one must wonder how
much tongue-in-cheek might have crept into the responses
on this mother-love topic). However, a significant over-
lap extends into the areas of computer application and
budgeting. Interestingly enough, the similarity of high
rating on these two for the respondents themselves is
found in a much lower rating given them for successors.
Again, there is a tendency within both the Operations and

F

the TSD-ISD groups to emphasize more of the human relations aspects of management in training recommended for their successors while focusing on the more organizational and technical aspects of management for themselves. This is not a marked tendency in the responses and should not weigh heavily in any recommendations, but it did emerge from both sets of responses.

In summary, the responses to this question clearly underscored the obvious, i.e. that officers about to assume a new position probably need more training than the incumbents now need -- or feel they need. They also indicate that attitudes toward management training are not significantly conditioned by the DO Officer's career concentration in the operational as contrasted with the technical and supportive aspects of DO work. They offer only very tentative guidelines, at best, as to what types of training should be provided to middle managers of the Agency.

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

II. To the extent that "experience is the best teacher," how can the Agency
insure that potential middle managers get the right experience? For
example, do you favor rotational assignments for on-the-job managerial
experience? Managerial 'internships'?

QUESTION II

This was designed as a control question to insure that
the respondents gave proper attention to the main thrust
of the questionnaire. It achieved this purpose reasonably
well -- or wasn't required for the purpose -- in view of
the thought and care that generally went into the responses.
However, the narrative license given the respondents
yielded a product that does not lend itself to statistical analysis
but does offer useful insights of a more general nature.

The responses from Directorate of Operations (DO) officers
were highly colored by ambiguities of "rotational assignments."
Many understood this to mean the normal DO career movement
between field and Headquarters while others looked upon
it more in terms of varying one's experience in different
operational settings. Some viewed the pros and cons of
movement within the division where home-based, or between
that division and other area divisions, but few responded
in terms of rotational assignments outside the DO. The
most significant generalization arising out of the responses
on rotational assignments is an emphasis on increasing
responsibility with each assignment during the career.
Several notable failures were mentioned in personal exper-
ience with rotational assignments.

CONFIDENTIAL

Probably the most general concern that was stated or
implied in answers to this question by DO officers was
that DO operational units must continue to be managed
by operationally-experienced personnel. The goal is to
couple this experience with managerial talent. A
significant number emphasized the need to identify that
managerial talent early in the career so that effective
planning could enter into assignments and career develop-
ment. Several suggested that this identification should
include testing of managerial aptitude at career outset;
others would have the DO rely more on performance evalua-
tion of early assignments for identification of aptitude
and skills. Implied in many of these observations, and
explicit in some, was the belief that "managers are
born, not made." Only by so identifying managerial
potential, can the DO consciously plan to develop it
through training and job assignments.

A vein of strong feeling runs through the DO responses
that some formal training should be coupled with managerial
experience and on-the-job-training (OJT) in the development
of DO middle managers. Some respondents focus in this
regard on a general broadening of perspective, others on
particular skills or techniques of management, while some
advocate the Advanced Operations Course as the best
preparation for increased managerial responsibility within
the DO. In any case, there are few purists who would

CONFIDENTIAL

adhere so closely to the "experience is the best teacher"
view that they would eschew all formal training in prepara-
tion for management. On the other hand only one respondent
suggested that formal training be prerequisite to manager-
ial assignments.

"Managerial internships" were even less understood by
DO respondents than were "rotational assignments." This
assignment concept was ignored or overlooked by many
respondents, with a significant number of others indicating
skepticism if not outright opposition. Two key problems
were seen by most critics. First, the work experience for
the intern, presumably there for a short period to learn
more than he is to contribute, would have a contrived and
unreal character in which the intern would be shielded
from the pressures and ramifications of decision-making.
Secondly, the critics expressed concern over the morale
and productivity of an operational unit clearly used as
a managerial training experience in the career advancement
of an Agency elitist.

Those officers who responded more positively to the
managerial internship concept were for the most part those
who saw it as, in effect, already being practiced by DO
assignments to deputy positions within Stations, Bases,
and Headquarters branches and desks. Five officers

commented on the need to delegate authority and responsi-
bility to these potential middle managers in order to make
their experience truly profitable. In this regard, two
officers recommended that senior officers be rated on
their ability to delegate supervisory responsibilities,
while four officers reiterated the importance of adequate
evaluation in selecting and retaining those who should
manage.

Three officers commented on the value of experience gain-
ed through service on personnel evaluation panels of the
DO, stating or implying that this service was one of the
better managerial exposures one could obtain for career
development in the DO. A like number commented on the
value of other special assignments, short tours, and
service on task forces in exposing officers to practical
managerial experience. There were a few suggestions that
more positions of the executive officer type be created
whereby more officers might be given opportunity to
study first-hand the operational and organizational
leadership of capable managers. Two respondents extended
their remarks to urge that assignments to managerial
positions be made more frequently from the deputy position,

that is, promoting the deputy to the chief's position after he has had sufficient time to learn the position and develop certain managerial practices and techniques.

The general proposal for tutelage and understudy, whether through rotational assignments or otherwise, was supported with several different statements of rationale. One-eighth of those responding from the Operational Components commented specifically on the exposure to managerial styles and techniques, while one-seventh commented on the Agency's opportunity to test the officer under different managers and circumstances. Only a slightly smaller number observed generally on the broadening of background through change of assignment, while two officers stressed the stimulation of change; one pointedly recommended movement between positions in order to avoid going stale. One respondent recommended broader usage of directed assignments, presumably meaning field assignments, while another respondent observed that management problems within DO work are to be found principally at Headquarters, not in the field.

In summary, this question was loosely structured for a purpose but evoked rather broad concern for identifying managerial talent and providing that talent with opportunities for stimulation, growth and development, including formal training.

III. What specific training or managerial experience would you like to have
as you look ahead to increased managerial responsibilities?

Additional comments regarding training may be placed on reverse side.

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

QUESTION III

This question was intended to appeal to those ambitious officers who might not feel any great need for training in their current positions but who might look more favorably on training in their further career development. Ten of the sample (83) took themselves out of this category by direct reference to retirement planning (7), by commenting on the "twilight" portion of their career (2), or by reflecting philosophically on the career (1). To the extent that these ten officers commented on managerial training in answer to this question, they emphasized a need for managerial training to be given earlier rather than later in one's career.

The responses of the 73 officers who, presumably, are still looking ahead in their careers included a total of 138 references to various kinds of training (124) and experience (14). Five of the 14 comments on experience simply indicated a readiness and desire to be assigned as a Chief of Station (or Chief of TSD regional unit in one case). The other nine comments on experience mentioned rotational tours, promotion panels, ad hoc committees on such matters as policy or personnel, and assignments offering general opportunities for increased responsibility.

The 124 comments bearing on the more structured type of training included 26 explicit references to OTR courses as follows: Managerial Grid - 7; Fundamentals of Supervision and Management - 5; Mid-Career - 4; Advanced Management (Planning) - 4; Senior Seminar - 4; and the COS Seminar - 2. Sixteen officers stated a desire for what might be classed as prestige training opportunities, e.g. the senior service schools, the State Department Senior Seminar and the Federal Executive Institute. Ten respondents explicitly desire external training in management.

Twenty-four of the 73 respondents, or one-third of the sample, expressed a desire for advanced or senior management training, otherwise unspecified. Thirty-two specific mentions were made of managerial areas in which training is desired. Fourteen of these clearly fall into the behavioral category (e.g. handling people, personnel evaluation, sensitivity training); 18 were more in the organizational and technical categories (e.g. planning, programming, budgetting, decision-making, systems analysis, forecasting, measuring results, computer applications), although such items as "effective use of resources" would spill over into the behavioral as well. None of the organizational and technical areas was noted with a frequency worthy of highlighting.

In summary, the responses to this question indicate general favor among DO middle managers for management training in connection with their own career advancement.

IV. What is your opinion of existing internal and external training programs and how they relate to your current managerial responsibilities? From among the following courses, rate those which you have attended or with which you are familiar. To what extent are they (1) of Direct Managerial Benefit, or (2) of Indirect Managerial Benefit only, e.g., general orientation, familiarization, personal development?

Check (X) courses attended	(1) DIRECT MANAGERIAL BENEFIT			(2) INDIRECT MANAGERIAL BENEFIT		
	Much	Some	Little	Much	Some	Little
Internal Courses						
Managerial Grid (SMS (Grid))	M	S	L	M	S	L
Fundamentals of Supervision/Management (Management course)	M	S	L	M	S	L
Advanced Management Planning (AMP) (SMS (P))	M	S	L	M	S	L
Midcareer Course	M	S	L	M	S	L
Management Science for Intelligence	M	S	L	M	S	L
Other _____	M	S	L	M	S	L
External Programs						
Senior Service Schools (Indicate which school) _____	M	S	L	M	S	L
Program for Management Development (Harvard)	M	S	L	M	S	L
Career Education Awards Program (Formerly NIPA)	M	S	L	M	S	L
Executive Seminar Center Programs (CSC)	M	S	L	M	S	L
Foreign Affairs Executive Seminar	M	S	L	M	S	L
Other _____	M	S	L	M	S	L

Additional comments regarding existing courses may be placed on reverse side.

QUESTION IV

This question was designed to obtain an evaluation of
management training opportunities, internal and external,
as developed out of first-hand knowledge or from the
experience of others. Recognizing that many of these
opportunities transcend any normal definition of manage-
ment training in many cases, the respondents were asked
to denote indirect as well as direct managerial benefit
derivable from the training experience.

The responses on external training opportunities were
so scattered and fragmentary as to provide no satisfactory
basis for analysis. Strangely enough, the reactions to
the prestige training opportunities, while weighted
toward managerial benefit, viewed the direct managerial
benefits as either MUCH or LITTLE; the indirect managerial
benefits were largely concentrated in the SOME column.
The significance of this is difficult to assess.

Only four of the courses, all internal offerings,
were noted with sufficient frequency for analysis: Mana-
gerial Grid, Fundamentals of Supervision and Management,
Advanced Management (Planning), and the Mid-Career Course.
A fifth, Management Science for Intelligence, was seen to be
of SOME direct benefit by 3, and of SOME indirect benefit
by 4 but these numbers probably reflect more the lack of

knowledge about this course among middle managers than the benefits to be gained from it.

The Managerial Grid and the Mid-Career courses obtained the most response among the four -- 52 officers on the former and 56 officers on the latter. The other two courses, i.e. Fundamentals of Supervision and Management (FSM) and Advanced Management (Planning) (AMP), had responses from 25 and 28 respectively -- approximately half that of the Grid and Mid-Career. However, of those responding on the FSM and AMP, approximately 2/3 in each case gave first-hand reactions as a result of having taken the courses whereas only half of the respondents had taken the Grid and the Mid-Career.

The framework of the question gave the respondent opportunity to indicate managerial benefit ranging from much direct to little indirect, including combinations of direct and indirect. If we assume that training should ideally be directly applicable to the participant's work situation, it is satisfying to note that almost all respondents noted some degree of direct managerial benefit from the Grid, FSM and AMP. These three courses are designed as managerial training in a somewhat narrower sense of management than applicable to the Mid-Career where 79% still found direct managerial benefit.

A similar pattern emerges from the responses on the four courses when we look at the degree of direct benefit obtained. Recognizing that MUCH and SOME are both positive degrees while LITTLE might have been interpreted as either very little or none, we find that 88% of the respondents found MUCH-SOME direct managerial benefit in the Grid, 90% found MUCH-SOME in the FSM, 71% found MUCH-SOME in the AMP, and 64% found MUCH-SOME in the Mid-Career. Indirect managerial benefit is subject to widely different interpretations but very few officers chose this category for exclusive response on any of the four courses. A clear to heavy majority of those noting indirect managerial benefits from the Grid, FSM and AMP noted that degree as SOME. The Mid-Career pattern of indirect benefit shows 48% of the respondents using MUCH and 43% using SOME, that is, a spread over the two positive areas rather than the concentration in SOME seen for the other three courses.

A good summary of the reactions on this question is found in the words of one of the respondents: "I think the Agency has excellent courses in supervision and management, e.g. Managerial Grid, Supervision, Mid-Career and Advanced Management Planning. Something was lost when Advanced Management Planning was dropped. I suggest it be reactivated with added emphasis on management analysis."

(A postscript is necessary on this question, although
not related directly to the mission of the Task Force.
Those questioned were all middle managers with responsi-
bility for the training of their direct subordinates and
a larger number of personnel supervised by those subordin-
ates. Yet 31 of 83 (37%) gave no response on the Grid;
58 (69%) gave none on the FSM; 55 (66%) gave none on the
AMP; and 27 (33%) gave none on the Mid-Career. Twelve
of the 83 (14%) explicitly stated that their knowledge
of these courses was so limited or lacking entirely that
they could not respond to the question.)

ADMINISTRATIVE - INTERNAL USE ONLY

REPORT OF THE MANAGEMENT TASK FORCE

FOR THE

DEPUTY DIRECTORATE FOR MANAGEMENT AND SERVICES

STAT

DD/M&S Representative

10 April 1973

ADMINISTRATIVE - INTERNAL USE ONLY

CONTENTS

APPENDIX

ADMINISTRATIVE - INTERNAL USE ONLY

ADMINISTRATIVE - INTERNAL USE ONLY

PURPOSE

The purpose of the Management Task Force was to identify the management training needs of middle level managers, primarily as seen by the middle managers themselves, but also by considering the view of other personnel conversant with the responsibilities of middle managers and their training needs.

1

ADMINISTRATIVE - INTERNAL USE ONLY

ADMINISTRATIVE - INTERNAL USE ONLY

METHODOLOGY

The Task Force initially settled upon a working definition of a 'middle manager,' in order to identify its target group. The middle manager was seen as an individual in the GS-13 to 15 grade range, a Chief or Deputy Chief at the Division level in the Management and Services Directorate, and basically a person whose responsibilities included the supervision of other supervisors. In some cases, the individuals included in the Task Force survey met all of these criteria. In other cases, the criteria were not all met. For instance, it became apparent that there are Division Chiefs in the DD/M&S who are above grade GS-15. In other cases, individuals were included who had no current supervisory responsibilities, but who have held middle management positions or who might be expected to do so in the future.

The Task Force conducted its survey by means of a questionnaire (Tab A) circulated to 320 persons, including 100 in the DD/M&S, and supplemented the questionnaires with a number of additional personal interviews.

Based upon criteria provided by the Office of Training, the Office of Personnel produced an initial machine run of possible candidates for the survey. In addition, the Position Control Register was reviewed by Office within the DD/M&S, and a base listing

2

of 256 persons was compiled. From this base listing, 100 candidates

for the survey were selected, broken down by Office and Grade as

follows:

TABLE 1

	OS	OMS	OC	OL	OF	OTR	OP	Support Staff	Total
GS-17						1			1
GS-16	1		6	2	1	1			11
GS-15	6	1	6	9	4	5	7	1	39
GS-14	8		10	6	3	3	3		33
GS-13	1	1	4	3	3	1	2		15
GS-12	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	1
	16	2	26	21	11	11	12	1	100

The sampling concentrated on the GS-14 and 15 level, but included

the extremes of a GS-12 and a GS-17. The largest component in the

Directorate, the Office of Communications, was not given its full

proportionate weight in the survey, simply in the interest of obtaining

large enough samples from the other Offices for comparison purposes

and yet not exceeding a manageable number of questionnaires.

Eighty questionnaires were completed and returned to the

Task Force in sufficient time to be included in the analysis that

followed. However, five of these questionnaires were only partially

useable due to incomplete information. Generally, the question-

naires indicated that the respondents had given thought and attention

3

to answering the questions. Fifteen follow up interviews of persons

completing the questionnaire were conducted in the DD/M&S, and ten

Office Directors and Deputy Directors were also interviewed.

Additional background information on the participants in the survey

was obtained from Office of Personnel and Office of Training records.

4

ADMINISTRATIVE - INTERNAL USE ONLY

RESPONDENT PROFILE

Analysis of the questionnaires indicated that the average age of the respondent was 47.8 years, with a range from 35 to 58 years old.   The average grade was GS-14.4 and the average length of time with the Agency was 20.4 years (Tab B).   As a group, the respondents had 4.1 supervisors reporting to them.

A similar analysis of age, grade, length of time on duty and supervisory responsibility was made according to Office, and revealed no significant departure from the norms of the group as a whole.

5

SPECIFIC TOPICS ADDRESSED IN THE SURVEY

I.   From a listing of 24 managerial responsibilities grouped into

six categories, the respondents were asked to select those areas in

which they felt they needed additional training, and those areas in

which their successors would require training. They were also

requested to rate those training needs on a scale of Much, Some

or Little training required.

A highly positive response was received, both as to the

respondents' training needs and that of their successors. Considering

the 24 managerial responsibilities as a whole, 77.4% of the respondents

indicated that they needed training, and 87.3% recommended training

for their successors. (Tab C)

The apparent difference between the respondents' own training

needs compared to that of their successors is further illuminated,

however, if the differences between the Much, Some and Little ratings

is examined. Assigning arbitrary weights of 3, 2 and 1 to the ratings,

the respondents recommended an additional 37% training for their

successors over their own perceived training needs.

None of the training areas was rated so low as to be unimportant

to the respondents. Again using an arbitrary weight factor, the

lowest ranked area for the respondents' own training needs,

"Coordinating" was scored at 81, while the highest ranked area,

"Computer Application," was scored at 142. The lowest ranked area for their successors, "Contract Management" was scored at 115, while the highest ranked area, "Measuring Results," was scored at 173.

Of the respondents' own training needs, the six highest ranked were work or task oriented (Computer Application, Measuring Results, Forecasting Techniques, Developing Performance Standards, Budgeting and Programming) whereas the six highest ranked needs of their successors were work and people oriented (Measuring Results, Communicating, Developing Performance Standards, Computer Application, Evaluating Performance and Career Management).

While the order in which the respondents ranked their own training needs differed from the order in which they ranked their successors' needs, their successors' needs exceed their own needs in each of the 24 areas. The greatest difference was scored on "Communicating." The closest scoring occurred in "Forecasting Techniques" and "Operations Research." (Tab D)

The only difference that emerged when the results were analyzed according to age group was that the younger respondents in the 35 to 39 age bracket tended to rank both their own and their successors' training needs higher than the other respondents.

7

II.   The second item on the questionnaire asked for comments

on how the Agency might insure that potential middle managers get

the right experience, posing for examples rotational assignments

for on-the-job experience and managerial internships. Generally,

the respondents used this question to expand their comments beyond

the limited scope of the Task Force, namely to identify the training

needs of middle managers, and to delve into the broader areas of

career development, the role of a manager, and related matters.

A majority of the respondents reacted favorably to the idea of

rotational assignments, either for the experience to be gained or

exposure to other components. A few noted that although rotational

assignments might possibly be disruptive, the long range benefits

were still worthwhile. Some qualified their endorsement by noting

that rotational assignments should occur within the context of planned

career development and that the reason for the rotational assignment,

i.e., as an integral part of overall development, should be explained

to and understood by the employee. There were several negative

comments against the idea of rotational assignments just for the

sake of rotation. The comments were varied as to whether rotational

assignments should be limited to assignments within an Office, or

within a Directorate, or expanded to include assignments across

Directorate lines, although most respondents placed no restrictions

on rotational assignments. One respondent stated that an effective

middle manager should be able to perform satisfactorily in any similar role in any part of the Agency. Several noted that in order to be truly beneficial, rotational assignments should entail an opportunity to manage and to gain on-the-job experience as a manager rather than just performing minor functions. These comments were consistent with the expressed opinions that there should be greater delegation of authority to insure that middle managers had the opportunity to develop managerial skills.

One respondent was of the opinion that many of the designated Support or Administrative Career positions should be opened to members of the other DD/M&S Career Services, to allow specialists to develop broader managerial skills. Another comment concerned the greater use of task forces as a means of acquiring broader exposure and experience.

A few individuals noted that in certain specialized areas, rotational assignments would be of little benefit unless they were limited to individuals with the necessary specialized skills.

There was a significantly less enthusiastic response to the idea of managerial internships, some persons noting that they felt internships were inappropriate at the middle manager level. Those who favored them felt they would be beneficial only if they provided an opportunity to work closely with senior, more experienced managers, and if the programs were small and closely monitored.

9

A recurrent theme emphasized that individuals with managerial potential should be identified early in their careers, and that such persons should be assigned to a series of increasingly responsible positions where their progress and performance could be continually evaluated. Three persons suggested that greater use should be made of psychological assessment in identifying potential managers. There was also a strong recommendation that some means of rewarding individual performance be found, other than promotion to managerial positions, for which individuals might be unsuited or unqualified.

Again, there were several comments about the need to plan assignments and to anticipate training needs, although it was appreciated that plans could not always be cast in concrete. In this regard, there was also a desire for better qualified component training officers, conversant with both the needs of an Office and available training programs, to assist individuals in judging training needs. There appeared to be general acceptance of the fact that formal training should play an important role in the development of competent managers, along with the opportunity for actual on-the-job managerial experience. Training should precede or come shortly after an individual's selection for a managerial position, and should include orientation to the role of a manager as well as instruction in managerial skills.

Only a minor few ascribed completely to the idea that "experience is the best teacher," indicating that actual experience also provided the best opportunity for evaluating managerial performance.

Some other suggestions included the idea that management training should be expanded to include part-time and even correspondence courses, so that more employees might avail themselves of training opportunities. It was also suggested that more recognition be given to individual efforts at self-improvement.

III. The first part of the questionnaire was directed to obtaining the respondents' attitudes toward 24 specific training areas. The third question, however, gave the respondents an opportunity to further comment about "training or managerial experience" which they would like to have, looking ahead to increased managerial responsibilities.

With respect to training, the answers to this question were consistent with the results of Question I. Slightly more than 20% of the respondents replied that they had no current need for training or additional managerial experience. Half of these based their answers upon "age and length of service" or retirement plans, although one of these stated that he would have benefited in the past from exposure to the Midcareer Course or a Senior Service School. The others who cited no current needs indicated that their

previous training and varied assignments had adequately prepared them for present or anticipated managerial responsibilities. One of these also indicated that he kept abreast of developments in the managerial field through available literature.

Two persons replied that they were unable to identify their training needs inasmuch as they did not know what their future assignments would be. This thought was also expressed by several other persons during the follow up interviews.

Over 75% of the persons queried answered the question affirmatively, that is, either in general terms indicating a desire for additional internal or external management training, or specifying courses or programs in which they were interested. A relatively small number indicated a need for any Agency re-orientation as such, but several stated that management training should be related to Agency problems rather than just management theory. Apparently reinforcing this view, others desired to participate in small management seminars of ten to twelve persons in which common management problems could be discussed and ideas exchanged between participants from different components.

There was an expressed desire for training in personnel management and counseling, and one respondent felt that a course in practical psychology would be useful in this regard.

12

Again consistent with previous answers, about half of the affirmative respondents mentioned planning and programming, budgeting, computer applications, analysis techniques, management by objective and productivity measurement as areas in which they desired additional training.

Some indicated that they should have had additional formal management training prior to this time.

Most persons indicated a desire for additional training without specifying a particular course or program. The most frequently mentioned external program was the Program for Management Development at Harvard, although the Senior Service Schools, Civil Service Commission Executive Seminar Program and the Federal Executive Institute were also mentioned by several persons. Among the internal courses specifically mentioned in this section were the Midcareer Course, Fundamentals of Supervision and Management, the Managerial Grid, the Senior Seminar and the Advanced Management (Planning) course. Most persons were unaware of the fact that the AM(P) Course is no longer offered.

Included in the managerial "experience" desired were assignment to the DD/M&S Staff, overseas assignments, and assignment outside the parent Office, including an assignment to the DDO.

One element lacking in the responses to this question was that in most cases, no reasons were given as to why the respondents

13

desired a particular course or program. It may be that in the case of the Harvard program and the Senior Service Schools, there is a certain status factor that attaches to being selected for the program. However, in a few cases, the opportunity to "expand horizons" and to keep abreast of changes on the Governmental and national scene were offered as reasons for additional training. But there were also some opinions about the individual's own responsibility to acquire the requisite "training" and knowledge to do his job, rather than relying solely upon formal training presented or sponsored by the Agency. There was also a comment about the lack of feedback from those employees who had attended external training programs.

IV.   The final part of the questionnaire permitted the respondents to rate certain courses and programs which have been offered by the Office of Training, basing their ratings upon either having attended the courses or having an opinion about them. Specialized skill courses and language courses were not included.

Twelve of the respondents had not attended any of the listed courses. The following table illustrates the number of courses taken by the remaining sixty-eight persons, including the listed courses and other management-related courses added by the respondents:

14

TABLE 2

	Internal	External	Attendees
1 Course	13	6	19
2 Courses	29	5	17
3 Courses	37	11	16
4 Courses	37	11	12
5 Courses	15	5	4

On the average, the respondents attended just over two courses each. In an analysis by Offices within the Directorate, this average is fairly consistent, with the possible exception of the Office of Training, where the average is just over three courses per respondent. There appears to be no appreciable difference in the average number of courses when the group is broken down according to age or length of service, except for those with over twenty-five years of service, where the average declines to 1.5 courses.

A comparison was made of the course ratings by persons who had attended the courses, and the ratings by persons who had not attended but who had an opinion about the courses listed. Of those who had attended, 59% rated the courses as having been of Direct Managerial Benefit, as opposed to 41% who rated the courses as having been of Indirect Managerial Benefit. This paralleled the ratings by those who had not attended the courses but who did express an opinion. Fifty-eight percent indicated Direct Managerial Benefit and 42% indicated Indirect Managerial Benefit. (Tabs E, F)

In addition to the listed courses, the respondents also indicated that they had attended other management related courses and programs, including the Department of Agriculture Management Course, Columbia University Executive Program in Business Administration, University of Wisconsin Executive Development Institute, Cornell University Executive Development Program, the Federal Executive Institute, Brookings Institute, and a tour with the Management Advisory Group.

16

CONCLUSIONS

There is an affirmative attitude toward management training,

even though this attitude is tempered with the realization that

training alone will not produce a good manager. Moreover, training

is seen as beneficial, but only in the light of overall planned career

development. The early identification, selection and development of

those with managerial potential is seen as a critical factor in

improving Agency management. There is an equal emphasis placed

upon the value of on-the-job training, including the experience to be

gained, the opportunity to work with and observe superior managers,

and the opportunity to develop management potential by actually

managing. Many middle managers see themselves as managers in

name only, and are critical of the fact that there is not enough

delegation of authority by superiors. Put another way, many

middle managers are not sufficiently involved in the management

process and see themselves as little more than first line supervisors.

There is an awareness that there is too much parochialism in the

Agency and many look upon training not merely as a means of

acquiring some substantive managerial skills but also as a means

of expanding communication between Agency components. Rotational

assignments, beginning at the GS-13 level or even earlier, are seen

as one of the most effective means of obtaining the experience

needed by middle managers to prepare for executive responsibilities.

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR MIDDLE MANAGERS

The Executive Director-Comptroller has asked the Office of Training to conduct a management training program for middle managers of the Agency. As a first step in developing such a program the Office of Training with the cooperation of the Deputy Directors has formed a Task Force composed of one representative from each of the four Directorates and under the chairmanship of an OTR officer. The mission of the Task Force is to idenify the training needs of middle managers and to make recommendations to the Director of Training.

The Task Force is now soliciting your opinion on the subject of management training for you and your successors.

Return questionnaire by 26 February 1973: Management Task Force
202 Chamber of Commerce Bldg.

Name_____

Age	EOD	How many employees in your unit?	How many supervisors report to you?

If not delivered, please return to sender.

I. From the list of managerial responsibilities below, select those areas in
which you need training and those in which your successor will need training.
Indicate the extent of the training required by checks in the two columns on
the right. If the list is not complete as far as your job is concerned,
please add as required.

RESPONSIBILITIES   YOUR TRAINING NEEDS   SUCCESSOR'S TRAINING NEEDS

	Much	Some	Little	Much	Some	Little
Planning						
Setting objective						
Programming						
Budgeting						
Records management						
Other						
Organizing						
Encouraging innovation						
Coordinating						
Allocating resources						
Other						
Staffing						
Selecting personnel						
Career management						
Evaluating performance						
Other						
Directing						
Delegating of authority						
Motivating						
Communicating						
Leadership						
Conference management						
Scheduling of work						
Other						
Controlling						
Developing performance standards						
Measuring results (productivity)						
Counseling						
Disciplining						
Contract management						
Other						
Analysis						
Computer application						
Operations research						
Forecasting technique						
Other						

II. To the extent that "experience is the best teacher," how can the Agency insure that potential middle managers get the right experience? For example, do you favor rotational assignments for on-the-job managerial experience? Managerial 'internships'?

III. What specific training or managerial experience would you like to have as you look ahead to increased managerial responsibilities?

Additional comments regarding training may be placed on reverse side.

IV. What is your opinion of existing internal and external training programs and how they relate to your current managerial responsibilities? From among the following courses, rate those which you have attended or with which you are familiar. To what extent are they (1) of Direct Managerial Benefit, or (2) of Indirect Managerial Benefit only, e.g., general orientation, familiarization, personal development?

Check (X) courses attended	(1) DIRECT MANAGERIAL BENEFIT			(2) INDIRECT MANAGERIAL BENEFIT		
	Much	Some	Little	Much	Some	Little
Internal Courses						
Managerial Grid (SMS (Grid))	M	S	L	M	S	L
Fundamentals of Supervision/Management (Management course)	M	S	L	M	S	L
Advanced Management Planning (AMP) (SMS (P))	M	S	L	M	S	L
Midcareer Course	M	S	L	M	S	L
Management Science for Intelligence	M	S	L	M	S	L
Other _____	M	S	L	M	S	L
External Programs						
Senior Service Schools (Indicate which school) _____	M	S	L	M	S	L
Program for Management Development (Harvard)	M	S	L	M	S	L
Career Education Awards Program (Formerly NIPA)	M	S	L	M	S	L
Executive Seminar Center Programs (CSC)	M	S	L	M	S	L
Foreign Affairs Executive Seminar	M	S	L	M	S	L
Other _____	M	S	L	M	S	L

Additional comments regarding existing courses may be placed on reverse side.

TAB B

Age Group	Number*	Average Grade	Length of Service
35 to 39	6	13.7	12 Yrs.
40 to 44	16	13.8	19.1 Yrs.
45 to 49	22	14.6	21.9 Yrs.
50 to 54	24	14.7	22.7 Yrs.
Over 55	7	14.7	24.4 Yrs.

*Only 75 of the 80 questionnaires were used to derive this data, since five of the questionnaires lacked the necessary information.

TAB C

RESPONSIBILITIES	YOUR TRAINING NEEDS			SUCCESSORS' TRAINING NEEDS		
	Much	Some	Little	Much	Some	Little
Planning						
Setting Objectives	10	27	19	22	36	7
Programming	13	32	16	27	32	7
Budgeting	12	31	22	27	31	11
Records Management	3	28	29	11	31	23
Organizing						
Encouraging Innovation	7	23	26	21	35	8
Coordinating	3	19	34	21	30	13
Allocating Resources	9	21	30	27	27	14
Staffing						
Selecting Personnel	8	16	29	22	26	15
Career Management	11	29	18	31	26	10
Evaluating Performance	12	21	27	29	32	7
Directing						
Delegating of Authority	5	20	29	16	36	11
Motivating	7	31	21	28	30	9
Communicating	12	23	24	35	27	8
Leadership	4	32	20	26	31	8
Conference Management	6	33	19	18	35	10
Scheduling of Work	6	23	28	21	28	16
Controlling						
Developing Performance Standards	14	34	12	33	31	6
Measuring Results (Productivity)	18	31	15	35	31	6
Counseling	8	28	21	23	33	11
Disciplining	6	22	24	15	28	19
Contract Management	9	19	24	18	19	23
Analysis						
Computer Application	26	27	10	32	28	7
Operations Research	20	21	16	24	18	17
Forecasting Technique	21	25	14	23	25	15
TOTALS	250	616	527	585	706	281

TABLE

Rank	Respondents' Training Needs		Successors' Training Needs		Score Difference
	Area	Score*	Area	Score*	
1	Computer Application	142	Measuring Results (Productivity)	173	+ 42
2	Measuring Results (Productivity)	131	Communicating	167	+ 61
3	Forecasting Techniques	127	Developing Performance Standards	167	+ 45
4	Developing Performance Standards	122	Computer Application	159	+ 17
5	Budgeting	120	Evaluating Performance	158	+ 53
6	Programming	119	Career Management	155	+ 46
7	Operations Research	118	Budgeting	154	+ 34
8	Career Management	109	Motivating	153	+ 49
9	Communicating	106	Programming	152	+ 33
10	Evaluating Performance	105	Allocating Resources	149	+ 50
11	Motivating	104	Leadership	148	+ 52
12	Setting Objectives	103	Counseling	146	+ 45
13	Conference Management	103	Setting Objectives	145	+ 42
14	Counseling	101	Encouraging Innovation	141	+ 48
15	Allocating Resources	99	Coordinating	136	+ 55
16	Leadership	96	Scheduling of Work	135	+ 43
17	Records Management	94	Conference Management	134	+ 31
18	Encouraging Innovation	93	Forecasting Techniques	134	+ 7
19	Scheduling of Work	92	Selecting Personnel	133	+ 48
20	Contract Management	89	Delegating Authority	131	+ 47

TAB D

(CONTINUED)

	Respondents' Training Needs		Successors' Training Needs		Score Difference
Rank	Area	Score*	Area	Score*	
21	Disciplining	86	Operations Research	125	+ 7
22	Selecting Personnel	85	Disciplining	120	+ 34
23	Delegating Authority	84	Records Management	118	+ 24
24	Coordinating	81	Contract Management	115	+ 26

*The scores were arrived at by weighing the responses (Much = 3, Some = 2, Little = 1 and No Response = 0) and adding to produce a cumulative score of all respondents for each area.

	Direct Managerial Benefit			Indirect Managerial Benefit		
	Much	Some	Little	Much	Some	Little
Internal Courses						
Managerial Grid (45 Attendees)	17	19	5	15	13	1
Fundamentals of Supervision/Management (32 Attendees)	15	12	2	6	7	2
Advanced Management (Planning) (26 Attendees)	16	8	1	7	5	2
Midcareer Course (26 Attendees)	14	5	4	13	3	1
Management Science for Intelligence (1 Attendee)	1	—	—	—	1	—
130 Attendees	63	44	12	41	29	6
External Programs						
Senior Service School (12 Attendees)	4	2	3	4	4	
Program for Management Development (Harvard) (5 Attendees)	1	3	1		2	2
Career Education Awards Program (1 Attendee)			1*			1*
Executive Seminar Center Programs - CSC (4 Attendees)	2		1	2		1
Foreign Affairs Executive Seminar (5 Attendees)	—	1	—	—	4	—
27 Attendees	7	6	6	6	10	4
157 Attendees	70	50	18	47	39	10

68 of the respondents had attended one or more of the above courses, plus 12 other courses or programs which the respondents listed as related to management training.

*The respondent indicated that he had engaged in specialized area studies, rather than broader management study.

TAB F

	Direct Managerial Benefit			Indirect Managerial Benefit		
	Much	Some	Little	Much	Some	Little
Internal Courses						
Managerial Grid (15 Opinions)	3	7	1	2	7	1
Fundamentals of Supervision/Management (15 Opinions)	7	8		4	1	2
Advanced Management (Planning) (11 Opinions)	3	7	1	1	3	1
Midcareer Course (22 Opinions)	9	8	2	10	5	
Management Science for Intelligence (6 Opinions)	2	2	1	1	3	—
69 Opinions	24	32	5	18	19	4
External Programs						
Senior Service Schools (10 Opinions)	2	3	2	4	3	
Program for Management Development (Harvard) (13 Opinions)	5	4	1	3	2	
Career Education Awards Program (5 Opinions)	1	2	1	1	1	
Executive Seminar Center Programs - CSC (15 Opinions)	5	5		3	5	2
Foreign Affairs Executive Seminar (9 Opinions)	2	2	2	4	1	—
52 Opinions	15	16	6	15	12	2
121 Opinions	39	48	11	33	31	6

The above figures are based upon comments by 35 persons who had not attended
the above listed courses or programs, but who had opinions about the direct
or indirect managerial benefit to be derived from them.

ADMINISTRATIVE — INTERNAL USE ONLY

MANAGEMENT TASK FORCE REPORT: DDI SECTION

STAT

1. We polled a large cross section of DDI middle management
by means of a questionnaire and follow-up interviews. The question-
naire was sent to 59 officers--primarily division chiefs--a sample
that included most second echelon supervisors in the directorate.
The response was quite satisfactory; answers were received from
43 individuals (73% of the sample). In nearly every case, the answers
were complete and thoughtful. Information gleaned from follow-up
interviews was very much in line with the views expressed in the
questionnaires--those interviewed had little to add to what had already
been said in one way or another in the questionnaires.

2. The average respondent is 49 years old and has been with
the Agency for nearly 20 years. He manages a unit of 45 - 50
employees with the help of four subordinate first-line supervisors.
His grade is GS-15. 15. Although the grade range for middle managers
was initially assumed to be GS-13 through GS-15, we soon recognized
that if we also held to our definition of middle management as "super-
visors of first-line supervisors," any such limitation would give a
badly distorted picture of DDI opinion. OBGI, OCI, OER, and OSR
would have gone almost entirely unrepresented. We therefore ignored

ADMINISTRATIVE — INTERNAL USE ONLY

grade limitations and sent the questionnaire to 20 persons in grade 16 and above and to 39 in grade 15 and below.

3. The extent of formal management training already received by individuals in the sample varies widely. According to their training records, one in ten had had no management training, either within the Agency or outside. On the other hand, nearly 85% have attended OTR courses related to management, although some of these courses bear only tangentially on specific problems of middle managers (e.g., the Grid, attended by one fifth of the sample, and the Midcareer Course, attended by one third of the sample). About 60% have attended OTR courses specifically designed as management training vehicles, such as Advanced Management (Planning) and the Senior Management Seminar. About 5% have not attended management-related courses offered by the Agency, but have taken such courses elsewhere-- principally those given by the Civil Service Commission. (More than a third of those polled have taken CSC management courses, generally in addition to Agency courses).

The Middle Managers' View of Training

4. DDI middle managers are receptive to management training, and most can point to general areas in which they (or, more often, their successors) could use instruction. Their support is qualified,

however, by the feeling that formal training should be viewed in the larger context of improving Agency management as a whole. Selecting the right people for managerial positions at all levels, giving them experience in varied assignments, and monitoring their performance to ensure that those unable to lead effectively are returned to non-supervisory positions are all part of the same problem. Formal training has a role to play, but much can be done informally within offices and directorates to improve the tone of Agency management.

5. In an effort to determine specific training needs, we included in our questionnaire a list of 24 topics, asking that the respondent indicate for each topic whether he--and his successor when he leaves--needed "much," "some," or "little" training. We had grouped the topics into six broad management functions: Planning, organizing, staffing, directing, controlling, and analysis. Most of the answers disregarded these groupings, however, and weighed each of the two dozen items on its own merits. In so doing, they may have attached unintended meanings to a few items. Nevertheless, when the 24 items are ranked in order of preference some patterns are apparent.

6. Not surprisingly, middle managers think their hypothetical successors need much more training than they themselves. Moreover, there is a reasonably clear pattern in the ranking of subjects to which

3

they think their successors should be exposed. Heading the list are items that could be broadly classed as human relations topics: motivating, communicating, career management, leadership, selecting personnel, counseling, and delegating authority. A lower priority is assigned to items that relate more to the techniques of management than to interpersonnel relationships. These include, in descending order of importance, allocating resources, programming, developing performance standards, coordination, measuring results, forecasting techniques, and scheduling work. Consigned to the bottom of the list are budgeting, operations research, records management, and contract management.

7. When the respondents turn to evaluating their own needs, the pattern is less clear. Communicating appears very near the top of the list, but in general the managers seem to be saying that they need far less coverage of human relations topics, particularly career management, selecting personnel, leadership, and delegating authority. They tended to put "management science" topics nearer the top of the list--though in no subject did they feel they needed as much training as their successor. Budgeting, contract management, and records management again appear at the bottom of the list, joined in this case by coordination.

4

8. Computer application receives high priority in both lists. It is in fourth place in the successors' list, surrounded by human relations topics and well ahead of those dealing with "management science." It ranks first in the middle managers' own priority list.

9. In another portion of the questionnaire we asked for suggestions as to how to improve the preparation of managers other than by formal training. Although the responses were couched in generalities, they reinforced our impression that efforts to improve management should involve an integrated approach that includes careful selection of personnel, the assignment of tasks designed to develop and test leadership potential, the placement of personnel in jobs that give them an opportunity to understudy and act for successful managers, and rotational assignments--all these experiences to be supplemented by formal training.

10. Rotational assignments, (which were cited as an example in the questionnaire itself) drew heaviest comment; nearly all respondents had something to say on the subject. Only three were negative. The rest were about evenly divided between those who favored an increase in rotational assignments--both within and among directorates-- and those who favored rotation in principle, but with certain reservations. Some thought rotation is a good idea "where practical"; others stipulated that the period of assignment should be long enough

(a year or two) to give the individual a real stake in the job. Some, particularly in technical fields, thought that rotation, while desirable, should be limited to specific occupational specialities. About a fifth of the answers mentioned "internships," almost always in negative terms. Those opposing internships thought they were artificial and of too short duration to be meaningful.

11. A significant number of respondents--about one in five-- recommended some regular system of seminars or executive sessions to stimulate a broader exchange of views among agency managers. Some had in mind sessions in which middle managers could discuss the Agency's objectives and philosophy with officials at the executive level. Others wanted freewheeling talks with officers in other components and directorates.

Conclusions

12. DDI managers' assessments of their own and their successors' needs indicate that a middle management training program should lean heavily on the social interactive aspects of management and supervision. DDI second echelon managers are primarily supervisors of people. This is, of course, the aspect of managing that is hardest to teach, and that in some senses it may be unteachable. Nevertheless, much could be done through seminars, group study, and perhaps sessions with

competent and respected outside experts, to heighten the participant's awareness of responsiveness to the psychological dimensions of his management problem. At a minimum, it should serve as an introduction to the sizable body of useful literature on the subject.

13. A program should acquaint participants with the various schools of management, including an examination of the merits and disadvantages of each. It should not try to turn out the complete management expert. Officers whose work requires training in greater depth should be encouraged to attend one of the several intensive external management programs.

14. Computer application should be covered at non-technical level to familiarize participants with the possibilities and limitations of ADP. If this is not feasible, there should be some provision for enrolling interested individuals in an appropriate computer course elsewhere.

15. The criteria for attendence should be flexible enough to permit the enrollment not only of middle managers and their deputies, but also of first-line supervisors who seem likely to move up the ladder to middle management positions. The age and length of service of incumbent middle managers suggest that many will be retiring in the next five to ten years. Moreover, given the fact that some have already

had management training, the pool may not be large enough to sustain a course for many runnings. On the other hand, we would expect to find among first-line supervisors a substantial reservoir of talented individuals who will be assuming greater responsibilities in the near future. These are the officers who might be most receptive to the program, and there is every advantage in preparing them for middle-management roles before they arrive on the job.

16. The grade level GS-13 through GS-15 is appropriate, assuming the flexibility on supervisory level recommended above. Insisting that participants be second-echelon supervisors but not supergrades would virtually rule out participation by several DDI offices. For that matter, there will be cases where individual super-grades should be invited--indeed urged--to attend.

8

Survey of Management Training Needs -- DDS&T

OSI/PSED/CB

STAT

STAT

Introduction

This report presents findings on S&T middle-manager

training needs obtained through a survey conducted by

an Agency Task Force under the Office of Training. The

study began in late January and by 15 April an overall

Agency report is to be prepared. Principal guidance was

STAT

provided by [   ], the Task Force Chairman.

Other members of the Office of Training, the Board of

Visitors for Training and many others also advised the

Task Force.

Procedure

The middle-manager is defined as a manager of working-

level supervisors, i.e., the Division Chief and his Deputy.

In some offices, such as ORD and OSA, the Division Chief

is really a first-line supervisor, for he has no branches

reporting to him. Yet, these chiefs were included in this

study because of their rank. The study was extended to

include a representative sample of Branch Chiefs. Several

Office Directors were also interviewed but only to gain

their views on the training needs of their Division Chiefs.

STAT

STAT

The total DDS&T middle manager population includes ☐Division Chiefs and ☐Deputy Chiefs -- not all Divisions have deputies.   Sixteen Branch Chiefs were sampled out of about ☐branches.   The average age of the Division Chief is about 48 years, the Deputy Chief, about 42 and the Branch Chief, about 36.   The average length of Agency service is 12, 11 and 7 years, respectively.

STAT

The Questionnaire.   The Task Force prepared a questionnaire as a means for quickly surveying the entire Agency population of middle-managers.   It was designed to elicit background information, interests and opinions relating to management training; it was not designed to pin point Agency's management problems, per se.

The DDS&T response to the questionnaire was about 64%, or 39 of the 61 questionnaires sent out.   The returns include 18 Division Chiefs, 10 Deputy Chiefs and 11 Branch Chiefs.

Interviews.   The questionnaire provided a basis for selecting individuals for interview.   The interviews expanded somewhat the size of the sample and improved its representativeness.   Also gained was some appreciation for

- 2 -

the attitudes of those who did not respond to the
questionnaire. Altogether, 19 interviews were conducted
which included 7 Division Chiefs, 5 Deputy Chiefs,
4 analysts, and 3 Office Directors.

Quality of Data. The questionnaire proved useful in
gathering the desired information; the reply percentage was
high and most respondents answered articulately and candidly,
though some of the data proved ambiguous and difficult to
quantify. Care was taken to provide a reasonably
representative sample and to minimize biases that could
affect the results. The responses of the middle-managers
appear free from "halo effects;" that is, the inclination
to provide what they may believe to be the desired answer.
The interview data is consistent with the questionnaire data.

To aid in the analysis, a considerable amount of
background information, such as past training, was gathered
from other sources.

Findings

Broad Training Needs. Although the Division Chief
is very articulate and interested in training as an
important management function, he views his own formal
training needs in management as minimal. His Deputy, being

- 3 -

younger and not as close to retirement, senses a somewhat greater need for management training for himself. The Chief and his Deputy believe that they have gained their best training through on-the-job experience, attained through government agency and industrial assignments. Some Chiefs have already had what they believe to be an adequate amount of general traditional management course work, yet he is likely to be interested in attending the prestige management training programs given by universities and the Government. He expects his successor to be similarly prepared for the job and to have had broad management training. He favors early identification and development of managerial talent through progressive rotation assignments and increasing opportunities for responsibility. He is often doubtful that management careers can be planned and recognizes that opportunities for gaining experience are limited.

He favors internships, but only in so far as they provide opportunity for assuming greater responsibility and participation in decision making under specially competent managers. Many internship experiences appear to have been unsuccessful because of poor management.

- 4 -

The Division Chief relies heavily on the existing natural selection process for good managers and not on training. Indeed, he distrusts training as a way of selecting or of "making" managers. The Chief tends to stress common sense and technical competence over management knowledge, though he appreciates the value of the latter.

The S&T manager has a conservative view of the role of general courses in management training. For him they are likely to be too theoretical and impractical. The general courses should be given early in one's career and at the beginning of management assignments, and above all should not conflict greatly with the pursuit of office work. When interviewed, he is not likely to admit freely to his own personal management problems, but he is willing to talk, in general, on problem areas where training may apply. Generally, he feels that both Agency and external management training have been of value to him.

He is especially interested in obtaining better orientation to Agency problems, to his role in the government and to world affairs generally. Hence, his frequent

- 5 -

expressions of interest in the executive seminar
courses of OT and in external training to broaden his
horizons. The executive management training programs
at Harvard, Brookings Institute, Civil Service Commission,
and other similar programs are highly regarded.

The Division Chief and Deputy Chief average between
1 and 2 management courses taken from the Office of
Training and between 1 and 2 external courses in
management. They are about equally trained in management.
The most frequent Agency course has been the Management
Grid course and the Advanced or Senior Management Seminar
or some earlier Agency management courses. External
training most often includes attendance at one of the
management seminars provided by the Civil Service Commission
or the USDA graduate school. About 15 percent have
attended courses provided by the Brookings Institute or by
various college management programs. About the same
percent have attended the senior service schools such as
the Industrial College of the Armed Forces. The Division
Chiefs of some offices are professionally trained in
management, and some of these are functioning more as
management specialists than as middle-managers. A few
appear to have had no management training at all.

- 6 -

ADMINISTRATIVE — INTERNAL USE ONLY

Many individuals have had one or more special courses in management, for example, R&D contracts and performance appraisal. Much of the Chief's management training is old, given 5 to 10 years ago or longer.

Individual Differences. Most believe that some form of management training would be useful, provided it is tuned to their own real problems. The specific needs of Division Chiefs appear to vary widely, mainly because of differences in experience and training and the differing functions of their Divisions and Offices -- to say nothing of the differences among Directorates.

The intelligence production offices such as OSI and FMSAC are interested, though cautiously, in the management sciences such as new analytical techniques and information systems in management, systems approaches and forecasting techniques. The technical offices such as ORD and OEL, while also interested in some aspects of management science, appear more interested in courses in advanced contract management and special courses for the management of engineers and technical projects. The OCS and OSA have special managerial and support functions, such as computer programming which are reflected somewhat in their management training needs. For example, some of

- 7 -

ADMINISTRATIVE — INTERNAL USE ONLY

the Chiefs in OSA function more as management specialists

than as middle-managers. Some of these managers are

very well trained in their management functions.

The major common denominators to all of the

Directorate's training needs are the manager's interest in

defining objectives, improving office communications,

the behavioral aspects of management, standards and per-

formance evaluation, and career management. The special

problem of managing scientific and technical personnel is

probably the quintessential difference that distinguishes

the training needs of this Directorate.

Areas of Training Interest

The expressions of training interest when taken

collectively suggest the continued need for across-the-

board training in management, at least early in the

manager's career. A number of special areas seem of

particular interest to the manager, which he tends to

think may be best satisfied by short seminars. While

some short courses are already available in contracting,

performance appraisal and ADP, other specific topics may

require similar attention.

Planning and Decision Making. The manager senses a need

for better understanding of Agency processes for planning,

ADMINISTRATIVE — INTERNAL USE ONLY

decision making, budgeting and coordination and his role
in these processes. He is interested in the objectives
of the Agency and the process of setting them and in
how to manage accordingly. He wants to understand better
modern planning techniques, but skeptical of some, such as
the PERT system when applied to his own programs. He has
an interest in how to plan for and manage unusual or
crisis situations. Training probably can continue to
help in these areas either through the Advanced Management
Planning Course or through special courses.

Behavioral Sciences and Career Guidance Aspects of Management.
A keen interest exists in such topics as motivation, leader-
ship, values, interpersonnel relationships, self-appraisal,
disciplining, employee guidance, drug abuse, youth culture
and other subjects in the management psychology field. These
interests were generally strong throughout. Very few
managers have had recent formal training in the behavioral
sciences, even as they may apply directly to management.
A definite training need exists in this area for the
Division Chief and the subject lends itself easily to
training.

Career management problems exist throughout the
Divisions, but the practicality of career planning programs

- 9 -

is often questioned, because of the limited opportunities
for advancement to management positions. The importance
of self-reliant initiative in career development is
occasionally mentioned, others feel that more responsible
attention should be given to career planning by the
Offices, perhaps through employee counseling, more
rotations and opportunities for assuming responsibility.
More understanding of employee needs and aspirations and
related Agency policies and practices seems to be needed
by managers. Training may have an important role in any
such management program.

Management Sciences. Interest in the management science
fields is strong. Among the subjects mentioned are systems
approaches to management, estimating and forecasting
techniques, problem solving and decision making. Operations
research, however, has acquired a bad name. Some Chiefs
expressed doubt that a useful short course could be
devised in management science by the Agency. This kind
of training is possibly more suitable when given externally
at universities under highly competent instructors. Yet,
some of the experience gained by some Offices in
technological forecasting, in estimating and planning
techniques may be a basis for short internal seminars.

- 10 -

ADMINISTRATIVE — INTERNAL USE ONLY

A significant number of managers are interested
in ways of introducing new ideas, new techniques or
technology into their operations. Indeed, the missions
of one or two offices (e.g., ORD) are partly addressed
to this problem. The introduction of new information
systems, new analytical tools, and forecasting techniques
are of high interest to some managers. The subject is
probably one that does not lend itself easily to training,
though a growing body of research on managing for
innovation exists in industry. The Agency, itself, has
some experience in this upon which to draw. Perhaps
more of our managers should be experts in how to
introduce new technology into Agency operations.

Other Specific Interests. A number of managers stressed
the problem of setting standards and evaluating performance,
the need for advanced training in contract supervision
stressing industrial practices in managing government
contracts, the need for more opportunities for self-appraisal
such as the Grid program, and the need for more orientation
to the management problems of the Agency and throughout
the intelligence community. Other managers stressed the
importance of improving communication skills at all levels.

- 11 -

Training Methods. Some managers have strong preferences
for the manner in which training is conducted. The need
for intensive demanding courses is sometimes stressed.
Tutorial approaches, case studies, research projects,
team work and exercises requiring much give - and - take,
are frequently suggested. Formal lectures on theory,
while considered useful, should be balanced with individual
participation. Emphasis is placed on real practical
problems.

Some feel that management classes should have a
variety of students from all of the Directorates and from
other agencies, as is already the case for some courses.
Others feel that classes, depending upon the subject
matter, should be homogeneous, sharing common problems
and clearances. Little interest is shown in courses
extending beyond 3 to 4 weeks, except for attendance
at the prestige schools such as Harvard and the National
Service schools.

Recommendations

An advanced general course in management should
again be made available for all managers preferably
early in their development or at the beginning of new
assignments. For this purpose, the Advanced Management

ADMINISTRATIVE — INTERNAL USE ONLY

Course (AMP) should be reinstated and modified in the light of current Agency problems. The Grid course should be continued and attendance by all managers encouraged.

Introduce a program of special management seminars designed to meet the specific needs of the Chiefs and the various offices. These seminars should concentrate on such subjects as Agency objectives and planning and thes decision making process in the Agency, especially as it relates to the Offices. The behavioral sciences and career guidance aspects of management are important problem areas of this Agency where training is strongly recommended. Managing innovations and other areas of management science are believed to be important enough for the Agency to encourage more external training.

Continue the broad orientation courses such as the world affairs and intelligence seminars for all chiefs.

Attention should be given to improving methods of instruction so as to stress participation in practical Agency problems and to make greater work demands upon the manager students.

- 13 -

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR MIDDLE MANAGERS

The Executive Director-Comptroller has asked the Office of Training to conduct a management training program for middle managers of the Agency. As a first step in developing such a program the Office of Training with the cooperation of the Deputy Directors has formed a Task Force composed of one representative from each of the four Directorates and under the chairmanship of an OTR officer. The mission of the Task Force is to idenify the training needs of middle managers and to make recommendations to the Director of Training.

The Task Force is now soliciting your opinion on the subject of management training for you and your successors.

Return questionnaire by 26 February 1973: Management Task Force
202 Chamber of Commerce Bldg.

Management Task Force representatives

25X1

OTR (Chairman)
OP
   DDI
ODS&T

202 Chamber of Commerce Bldg.

25X1

Name_____

Age	EOD	How many employees in your unit?	How many supervisors report to you?

25X1

If not delivered, please return to sender.

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

I. From the list of managerial responsibilities below, <u>select</u> those areas in which you need training and those in which your successor will need training. Indicate the extent of the training required by checks in the two columns on the right. If the list is not complete as far as your job is concerned, please add as required.

RESPONSIBILITIES   YOUR TRAINING NEEDS SUCCESSOR'S TRAINING NEEDS

Responsibility	Much	Some	Little	Much	Some	Little
<u>Planning</u>						
Setting objective						
Programming						
Budgeting						
Records management						
Other						
<u>Organizing</u>						
Encouraging innovation						
Coordinating						
Allocating resources						
Other						
<u>Staffing</u>						
Selecting personnel						
Career management						
Evaluating performance						
Other						
<u>Directing</u>						
Delegating of authority						
Motivating						
Communicating						
Leadership						
Conference management						
Scheduling of work						
Other						
<u>Controlling</u>						
Developing performance standards						
Measuring results (productivity)						
Counseling						
Disciplining						
Contract management						
Other						
<u>Analysis</u>						
Computer application						
Operations research						
Forecasting technique						
Other						

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

II. To the extent that "experience is the best teacher," how can the Agency
insure that potential middle managers get the right experience? For
example, do you favor rotational assignments for on-the-job managerial
experience? Managerial 'internships'?

III. What specific training or managerial experience would you like to have
as you look ahead to increased managerial responsibilities?

Additional comments regarding training may be placed on reverse side.

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

IV. What is your opinion of existing internal and external training programs and how they relate to your current managerial responsibilities? From among the following courses, rate those which you have attended or with which you are familiar. To what extent are they (1) of Direct Managerial Benefit, or (2) of Indirect Managerial Benefit only, e.g., general orientation, familiarization, personal development?

Check (X) courses attended	(1) DIRECT MANAGERIAL BENEFIT			(2) INDIRECT MANAGERIAL BENEFIT		
	Much	Some	Little	Much	Some	Little
Internal Courses						
Managerial Grid (SMS (Grid))	M	S	L	M	S	L
Fundamentals of Supervision/Management (Management course)	M	S	L	M	S	L
Advanced Management Planning (AMP) (SMS (P))	M	S	L	M	S	L
Midcareer Course	M	S	L	M	S	L
Management Science for Intelligence	M	S	L	M	S	L
Other _____	M	S	L	M	S	L
External Programs						
Senior Service Schools (Indicate which school) _____	M	S	L	M	S	L
Program for Management Development (Harvard)	M	S	L	M	S	L
Career Education Awards Program (Formerly NIPA)	M	S	L	M	S	L
Executive Seminar Center Programs (CSC)	M	S	L	M	S	L
Foreign Affairs Executive Seminar	M	S	L	M	S	L
Other _____	M	S	L	M	S	L

Additional comments regarding existing courses may be placed on reverse side.

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L